

and they will help us to invest in our future security and prosperity. This is the target. This is the way to get to long-term economic health.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHANNIS be recognized next and I be recognized following his remarks for up to 20 minutes; that following my remarks, Senator KYL be recognized, and following Senator KYL, Senator FRANKEN be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska.

ABORTION FUNDING

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak for about 10 minutes about the health care debate that continues to be in front of us. For much of our country, the health care debate has been a long and confusing trail. As details have emerged over the last weeks and months, constituents ask me: What is going to happen to my health care? Will I be able to continue to see the doctor I have always seen? They heard both sides argue the merits and the detriments of various pieces of legislation. Citizens are understandably skeptical and perplexed by the debate that has transpired.

One of the things I suggest that is very clear, one situation that is clear as a matter of policy and conscience is that Americans are against the Federal funding of abortion, whether they support or oppose the bill. Unfortunately, the Senate-passed health care bill allows taxpayer funds to fund abortion.

The current Senate language says people who receive a new government subsidy could enroll in an insurance plan that covers abortion. Nothing would stop them from doing that.

Some say: Yes, but States could opt out. What I point out is that in those States that opt out, the taxpayers would still see their tax dollars funding elective abortions in other States.

Additionally, the Office of Personnel Management can provide access to two multistate plans in each State, and only one of them would exclude abortions. OPM's current health care program, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, now prohibits any plans—any plans—that cover elective abortion. For the first time, a federally funded and managed health care plan will cover elective abortions.

Those who have looked at this language have said very clearly that it is woefully inadequate. I say that. It does not apply a decades-old policy—an agreement really—that was reached many years ago that was embodied in the Hyde amendment. The Hyde language bars Federal funding for abor-

tion except in the cases of rape and incest or where the life of the mother is at stake. The public has clearly rejected advancing the abortion agenda under the guise of health care reform.

Yet as we have seen the language of the Senate bill proceed, it seems very clear my colleagues are refusing to listen. They seem bent on forcing this very unpopular bill upon us via a rather arcane process called reconciliation.

The important point to be made today is this: Reconciliation will not allow us to fix the egregious abortion language.

This is not the first time I have come to the floor to speak about this issue. Last November, I came here to urge pro-life Senators to vote no on cloture if they wanted any chance to address the Federal funding of abortion in the Senate bill. I said then that if the language was not fixed before the debate began, there would be no way to fix it. We would not have any leverage to fix it.

I wish I were here on the floor today to say that I was wrong about that. Unfortunately, though, I was not wrong. Unfortunately, when an amendment was offered to match the Stupak language in the House bill with the Senate bill, only 45 Senators supported it.

The sad reality is that this Senate, as a matter of the majority, is not a pro-life body. There are not 60 Senators who are willing to vote for that.

Back in November, some of my colleagues disagreed with my assessment. There was a big debate. They said: Whoa, wait a second. We can fix this provision via an amendment, they said. But they were wrong. When the dust settled, we were left with a Senate bill that allows Federal funding of abortion.

The House is now being asked to vote on the Senate bill. You see, that is going to be the pathway: vote on the Senate bill so any fix on other provisions can come through a reconciliation sidecar.

According to the National Right to Life committee, the Senate bill is—and I am quoting their language—"the most pro-abortion single piece of legislation that has ever come to the House floor for a vote since *Roe v. Wade*."

They go on to warn:

Any House Member who votes for the Senate health bill is casting a career-defining pro-abortion vote.

There is talk that Democratic leaders might try to appease pro-life House Members by promising to change the Senate bill through a separate bill or the reconciliation sidecar I mentioned.

I urge pro-life supporters and pro-life House Members to think through this very carefully. Don't be fooled. Don't be lulled into thinking there are 60 votes in the Senate that will somehow rescue this situation. There are not. You do not have to take my word for it. It is in black and white in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is the same situation we faced in November.

The Senate specifically rejected the amendment that would have blocked

Federal funding for abortion. Nothing—nothing—has changed to suggest the Senate would have anywhere near 60 votes to support it now.

It was recently reported that some in the pro-life community support adding pro-life language in the reconciliation sidecar or maybe in a separate bill with the hope and the promise that somehow the Senate will swoop in and waive the rules and keep that language there. Let me be abundantly clear. As much as I might want that to happen, it will not happen here, as demonstrated by November's vote.

If the Senate rejects it again, the language in the Senate bill would become law. Current law would be reversed, and taxpayer dollars would, in fact, fund abortions.

There was recently a column in the Washington Post. It issued a warning to pro-life Democrats to be wary of this strategy. I am quoting again:

The only way they can ensure that the abortion language and other provisions they oppose are eliminated is to reject reconciliation entirely—and demand that the House and Senate start over with clean legislation.

I come to the Senate floor again to encourage my pro-life colleagues in the House to recognize the reality in the Senate. I tell them what they know already, and that is that many innocent lives are depending on their courage.

This issue should not be an issue of political gamesmanship, especially when the game is so rigged against pro-lifers. This is an issue of conscience. On this one, you are pro-life or you are not.

Agreeing to a strategy that is guaranteed to fail, one that has failed already in this health care debate in November, in my judgment, is not leadership at all. It is surrendering your values.

I leave the floor today, and I pray that my House colleagues will have the wisdom to understand this in their decisionmaking.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

STEEL INDUSTRY FUEL TAX CREDIT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to talk about two subjects—first, an amendment filed by Senator ROCKEFELLER, amendment No. 3371 to amendment No. 3336, cosponsored by Senator HATCH, Senator BAUCUS, Senator CASEY, Senator BAYH, and myself.

This amendment would extend the steel industry fuel tax credit and make minor technical corrections to ensure that the steel industry will continue to recycle the hazardous waste called coal waste sludge. The recycling process which converts coal waste sludge into steel industry fuel eliminates a hazardous waste, ends the need to landfill or incinerate the waste, displaces fuel from the coking process, and increases the efficiency of coke-making. This recycling process makes the production